DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 404 CS 510 018

AUTHOR Grupas, Angela
TITLE Development of a Plan for Integrating Gender Communication Research and Women's Preferred Styles of Learning into the Public Speaking Course at St. Louis Community College-Meramec.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 69p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (84th, New York, NY, November 21-24, 1998). For the Ed.D. Research Project this paper is based on, see ED 409 924.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Style; Communication Research; Community Colleges; *Females; Instructional Improvement; *Public Speaking; *Sex Differences; Sex Fairness; Surveys; *Teaching Methods; Two Year Colleges; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS Course Development; *Gender Issues; *Saint Louis Community College at Meramec MO; Speaking Style

ABSTRACT

St. Louis Community College-Meramec (SLCC-Meramec) is a metropolitan community college offering associate degrees, transfer, and certificate programs. Because of an anticipated increase in public speaking enrollment, the Communications Department Chair at SLCC-Meramec wanted to upgrade and improve the public speaking course content and methodology. A 5-phase project was used to develop a plan for incorporating gender communication content and gender-fair teaching methodologies into the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec. The first phase consisted of completing a series of literature reviews in response to four research questions. The second phase included an analysis of public speaking materials currently available and the instructional methods presently used in the communications classes. The third phase included the development and the distribution of a questionnaire to male and female professional speakers in the St. Louis area to determine gender differences in public speaking and the preferred methods of instruction. Questions were developed to note perceived gender differences in public speaking styles, and respondents were asked to provide suggestions for improving instruction. The fourth phase consisted of the development and execution of in-depth interviews to solicit information regarding male and female speaking styles, male and female preference for public speaking instruction and methodology, and the impact of gender differences on speaking styles. The fifth phase consisted of the development of a plan for making recommendations to the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec to incorporate gender communication content and gender-fair teaching methodologies into the public speaking course. (Contains a 325-item bibliography.) (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 404

DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN FOR INTEGRATING GENDER COMMUNICATION RESEARCH AND WOMEN'S PREFERRED STYLES OF LEARNING INTO THE PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE AT ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE-MERAMEC

Angela Grupas, Ed.D.

St. Louis Community College-Meramec

Paper Presented at the 1998 National Communication Association Convention,

New York City

November 21-24, 1998

CS 510 018

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Grupas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN FOR INTEGRATING GENDER COMMUNICATION RESEARCH AND WOMEN'S PREFERRED STYLES OF LEARNING INTO THE PUBLIC SPEAKING COURSE AT ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE-MERAMEC

by

Angela Grupas, Ed.D.

St. Louis Community College-Meramec (SLCC-Meramec) is a metropolitan community college offering associate degrees, transfer, and certificate programs. Because of an anticipated increase in public speaking enrollment, the Communications Department Chair at SLCC-Meramec desires to upgrade and improve the public speaking course content and methodology.

The purpose of this project was to develop a plan for incorporating gender communication content and gender-fair teaching methodologies into the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec. A total of five phases were executed to complete this project. The first phase consisted of completing a series of literature reviews in response to the first four research questions. The second phase included an analysis of public speaking materials currently available and the instructional methods presently used in the communications classes at SLCC-Meramec. The third phase included the development and the distribution of a questionnaire to male and female professional speakers in the St. Louis area. The intent of the questionnaire was to determine gender differences in public speaking and the preferred methods of instruction. Questions were developed to note perceived differences in male and female public speaking styles. Respondents were asked to provide suggestions for improving public speaking instruction. The fourth phase consisted of the development and execution of

in-depth interviews to solicit information regarding male and female speaking styles, male and female preference for public speaking instruction and methodology, and the impact of gender differences on public speaking styles. The fifth phase consisted of the development of a plan for making recommendations to the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec to incorporate gender communication content and gender-fair teaching methodologies into the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec.

Through the review of textbooks, literature, and data gathered from surveys and interviews, it was determined that men and women possess different public speaking styles as indicated through examples of gender differences regarding language usage, nonverbal communication, and evaluation procedures. An androcentric bias exists in public speaking course content, textbook selection, and teaching strategies. Whereas traditional education supports the male model of learning, females' preferred styles of learning are relational and collaborative. Activity-centered, analytical oriented, and a competitive approach to decision making are characteristics which represent the male model of learning. Feminist pedagogy, collaborative learning, and cooperative learning strategies were identified as enhancing women's styles of learning. Faculty-lead curriculum revision plans provide examples for transforming the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec.

Results from an analysis of 92 public speaking textbooks and tradebooks indicated that students of public speaking may be receiving gender-biased information from these texts because the content of these texts appears to exclude women. From the 139 questionnaires, respondents indicated that (a) the public speaking course does not use women's preferred styles of learning or include issues related to women or

multi-culturalism, and (b) the method of instruction and the gender of the instructor can affect the degree of gender differences in the classroom.

Fifteen interviewed respondents indicated that (a) men and women agree that different public speaking styles exist, and (b) men and women agree on descriptions of the most effective public speaking content, and (c) men and women agree on the most effective public speaking instructor.

In order to integrate gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies into the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec, the following components of the project were developed: (a) a reference manual was prepared, (b) a guide was developed, (c) three two-hour workshops were created, and (d) a campus-wide staff development program was developed. The reference manual consists of a compilation of research concerning men's and women's public speaking styles and inclusive teaching methodologies. The guide consists of gender communication materials within the context of public speaking, including curriculum revision plans. The workshops consist of three goals: (a) to create a common base of knowledge of gender differences in public speaking behavior; (b) to understand learning styles and women's preferred styles of learning; and (c) to identify the strategies which can be implemented to address women's preferred styles of learning, and incorporate gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies in the public speaking course. The purpose of the campus-wide staff development program is to increase faculty's awareness of gender communication research and inclusive teaching methodologies.

INTRODUCTION

St. Louis Community College-Meramec (SLCC-Meramec) is a metropolitan community college offering associate degrees, transfer courses, and certificate programs. Further, SLCC-Meramec offers a college transfer program, with ten options, and more than 90 career programs in areas such as horticulture, interior design, and law enforcement. The St. Louis Community College district consists of three main campuses and two satellite learning centers, which offer credit and not-for-credit courses for over 30,000 students. Within the St. Louis Community College district, the faculty numbers 435 full time and 1,908 part time instructors. SLCC-Meramec is the largest of the three campuses with an enrollment of approximately 14,000 students each semester. As of 1993, the average age of the community college student at the Meramec campus was 28 years, with the campus population composed of 59% female and 41% male students. Of the students, 71% attend classes part-time and 29% full-time.

The Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec is a multi-discipline, multi-facility educational center. Twenty-five communications courses are offered per semester, including speech communications, mass communications, journalism, public relations, advertising, and film studies. Three sections of the public speaking course are offered each semester. One section is offered during the evening. According to student survey responses conducted by the Communications Department for a 1993 Program Evaluation, students enroll in communications courses in order to: (a) fulfill general education requirements, (b) achieve an associate degree in Communication Arts, (c) improve existing job skills, (d) develop skills for the workplace, retrain or

achieve promotion, (e) increase personal growth and enrichment, and (f) explore a variety of opportunities prior to identifying a major and developing a definite educational plan (SLCC-Meramec, 1994).

Nature of the Problem

Two compelling factors suggest need for improvement in the public speaking course: (a) studies showing increasing enrollment expected at SLCC-Meramec, and (b) the preliminary review of the literature indicating the lack of gender-fair materials and teaching methodologies in public speaking courses. First, enrollment data and results from telephone surveys conducted by the Communications Department Chair from the Communications chairs at transfer institutions indicate an anticipated increase in enrollment. Second, preliminary reviews of literature indicate instructional methods and materials are not gender-fair and consequently suggest the public speaking course should be revised.

All degree-seeking and transfer students are required to enroll in at least one communications course, unless they have transferred in communications credit. Therefore, approximately 90% of the approximately 15,000 students on the Meramec campus take at least one communications course during their tenure at SLCC-Meramec (Dixon, personal communications, February 14, 1996). While 80% of the students elect to enroll in Oral Communications (COM 101), an increase of students who enroll in the Public Speaking course (COM 107) exists. During the Fall 1995 semester, the department chair of the Communications Department conducted telephone surveys with the chairs of Communications Departments at various four-year institutions and other transfer institutions to determine specific communications course

requirements. "Due to requirement trends in the business and education curriculums at some of the transfer universities, the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec expects, at minimum, a 25 percent increase in public speaking enrollment" (B. Dixon, Communications Chair, personal communication, April 15, 1996).

B. Dixon stated that many of the transfer institutions, such as St. Louis University, Concordia University-Wisconsin St. Louis Center (CUW-St. Louis), the University of Missouri system, and Webster University are requiring public speaking, especially in the fields of education and business (personal communication, January 23, 1996). As a result of the 1995 telephone survey, Dixon found that three universities and one state university system indicated similar changes in course requirements.

St. Louis University, for example, has redesigned the business curriculum to include a public speaking course as a requirement. Further, students registered in the Management and Communication major at CUW-St. Louis Center are required to enroll in a public speaking course. V. Schoedel, director of the CUW-St. Louis Center, indicated that many students choose to transfer public speaking course credits from SLCC-Meramec (personal communication, April 12, 1996).

The University of Missouri system requires education majors to enroll in the public speaking course. Webster University requires business and education majors to enroll in public speaking. These requirements will tend to cause an increase in the enrollment in the public speaking course at the Meramec campus by students planning to transfer to Webster University and the University of Missouri.

The Communications Department Chair at SLCC-Meramec indicated that due to anticipated enrollment increases in the public speaking course, the content and

methodology of the public speaking course should be reassessed. The lead faculty member of the public speaking course (the writer) was asked to undertake that task. "The trend in the public's understanding and focus of gender based issues points to a need for the revision of college courses just to stay current" (D. Dufer, Assistant Department Chair, personal communications, April 16, 1996).

A preliminary review of the literature supports the need for revisions of public speaking courses in general. While a plethora of texts, journals, trade manuals, and popular books on the subject of public speaking exists, research in the area of public speaking and gender is lacking. Over 92 public speaking texts and trade manuals have been published. Ample research in the area of male and female styles of communication exists (Pearson & West, 1991; Tannen, 1990; Wood, 1993). Fox-Genovese (1989) states that little doubt can be cast that the rules in public speaking have been gender specific (p. 32). Kramer (cited in Vonnegut, 1992) argues the need for more scholarship analyzing the differences between men and women speakers. When the literature concerning public speaking and gender communications is closely analyzed, it is apparent that with the exception of 12 academic journal articles, there is a lack of research incorporating public speaking and gender communication.

Rosser (1990) and Sandler (1991) refer to a definite "chilly climate" existing for women in math and science classes. Hall and Sandler (1982) maintain that a "chilly classroom climate" exists for women in higher education (p. 8). Wood and Lenze (1991a) reviewed researchers who have collectively surmised that contemporary western classrooms tend to favor men's ways of thinking and learning and to disconfirm women's ways (p. 17). This line of reasoning may also be appropriate as an

explanation for the absence of women in public speaking texts and the exclusion of citing women in the public speaking course (Campbell, 1991). Sprague reports that most public speaking texts feature speeches only by men (cited in Ivy & Backlund, 1994). Of five anthologies on the rhetoric of the American Revolution and the Constitution, only two include works by women (Vonnegut, 1992).

Evidence supports the assumption that public speaking is taught using an androcentric pedagogical slant (K. Foss, 1992; S. Foss, 1992; Makau, 1992; Rakow, 1993; Thomas, 1993). Argumentation courses perpetuate a patriarchal, hierarchical perspective (Makau, 1992). "Personal experiences and emotions [women's style], while viewed as powerful tools for persuasion, were considered ineffectual and, in fact, hazardous to good reasoning" (Makau, p.81). Gerlach and Hart (1992) support that female students do not interact in class at the same levels as male students. Studies by Aitken and Neer (1991), Gerlach and Hart (1992), Kelly (1991), and Pearson and West (1991) state that when identical classroom behaviors are demonstrated by male and female students, the female students' classroom behaviors are devalued by male and female instructors.

Certain writers of public speaking texts assume that all public speakers are similar and need to be trained and coached in the same manner (Linver, 1994; Mandel, 1993; Osgood, 1988; Smith, 1991). Thomas (1991) believes, "Women are held to standards of rhetorical excellence based on overcoming their gender, while males are held to different standards based on the ability to overcome problems. . ." (p. 46). In a 1986 study, Campbell discovered there is a feminine style of rhetoric (cited in Pearson, Turner, & Todd-Mancillas, 1991). While research on male and female speaking is

available, (Basow, 1992; S. Foss, 1992; Ivy & Backlund, 1994; Kearney & Plax, 1996), a lack of evidence indicates that a prescriptive text addressing the research does not exist.

This project was intended to develop a plan to incorporate gender communication materials and gender-fair teaching methods into the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec. Upon completion, the plan will be presented to the Communications Department Chair and full-time Communications faculty members for possible implementation by the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec. The combination of SLCC-Meramec's desire to revise the public speaking course in addition to reviews of the literature, provide evidence that revising the public speaking course content and instructional methodologies at SLCC-Meramec is necessary.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project was to develop a plan to incorporate gender communication content and gender-fair teaching methods into the public speaking course at St. Louis Community College-Meramec.

Background and Significance of the Problem

Data assembled from SLCC documents provide information indicating an anticipated increase in enrollment in communications courses. A preliminary review of literature suggests possible exclusionary course content and instructional methodologies at SLCC-Meramec, in particular, while academic research cited provides evidence of exclusionary content and methodologies in higher education, in general.

Speech Communication Association Competencies

A survey conducted by the Speech Communication Association (SCA), the national academic organization for Communications faculty, determined the competencies to be achieved in communications courses. The SCA developed communication competencies based on a survey of deans of instruction of the 1200 colleges belonging to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. In 1995, the SCA Task Force on Community College Competencies developed a core list of competencies which are essential for successful communication. The SCA reports that "Effective oral communication involves generating messages and delivering them in standard American English with attention to vocal variety, articulation, and nonverbal signals" (Speech Communication Association, 1995, p. 2).

Public Speaking Enrollment

According to the tabulation of enrollment at SLCC-Meramec in the public speaking course from Spring semester 1993 until Fall 1995, of a total of 376 students, 183 or 48.7% were women, while 193 or 51.3% were male. Thus, there appeared to be a fairly equal representation of both men and women in public speaking courses offered at SLCC-Meramec.

During the interim semester (May-June), enrollment data for the past three years indicated that 48 or 64.9% of females versus 26 or 35.1% of males enrolled in the interim public speaking course. There are two possible reasons for this enrollment trend. First, transfer credit is commonly devoid of grade assessment, whereby the student transfers three credits to the institution without the grade entering into the student's overall grade-point average. Second, the interim semester is an intensive

three-week course which meets each day of the week for 3 hours. "Traditionally, transfer students enroll during the interim semester to gain some college credits to transfer to their primary institution" (B. Dixon, personal communication, February 28, 1996).

Analysis of Public Speaking Texts and Tradebooks

Research has determined that public speaking texts and ancillary information exclude women and these texts maintain an androcentric bias (Ivy & Backlund, 1994; Stewart, Cooper, Stewart, & Friedley, 1996; Wood, 1994). To augment the reported research, the Communications Department Chair required the public speaking lead faculty member (the writer) to analyze public speaking texts and trade books. A total of 92 public speaking texts and tradebooks were analyzed to determine the amount of gender-inclusive information included within the content of the texts. Each text was analyzed according to five coding categories: (a) reference to "gender" in the index, (b) ratio of female-to-male speech examples, (c) multi-cultural reference, (d) mention of gender differences in language, and (e) reference to gender as part of audience demographics .

A summary of the results from this analysis indicate there is an absence of gender references in the public speaking texts and tradebooks. This review of public speaking textbooks and tradebooks, along with a summary of research materials concerning learning styles and inclusive teaching methodologies, was presented to the chair of the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec during a meeting about staff development programs. The department chair suggested that multi-cultural awareness, emphasizing gender, be implemented within the communications

curriculum . The writer of this project was awarded a sabbatical leave from the SLCC district to develop a plan involving the implementation of gender-fair course content and inclusive teaching methodologies in the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec.

Exclusion of Women

As enrollment statistics indicate, there has been an increase in socially diverse populations within the educational system, including an increase of women, minority students, and socially and economically disadvantaged students (Levine, 1989). With the increase of women attending college and entering the workforce, it is imperative that women receive the same academic instruction as men (Higginbotham, 1990). The exclusionary attitude concerning women and public speaking continues to prevail on the college campus (Campbell, 1991). S. Foss (1992) indicates that the male worldview and its accompanying value system are represented in college classrooms, particularly in the public speaking classroom (p. 53). Rakow (1992) believes that the current curriculum remains partial and incomplete, making invisible those who are not white, male, and worthy of study (p. 92).

The status quo in the public speaking area is one perpetuated by the absence of women and the focus on the androcentric model of discourse (Peterson, 1991). As early as 1976, researchers (Wheeler, Wilson, & Tarantola, 1976) reported that high-status speakers, including men and Anglo-Americans, have been perceived as more effective communicators than those persons perceived as having low status, mainly women.

Gilligan's, In a Different Voice, describes women's moral reasoning as distorted when it is interpreted within the predominantly male perspective (cited in Wood, 1993).

As early as 1982, Gilligan noticed differences from the white male norm in the female subjects of her study (cited in Anderson & Adams, 1992, p. 22). In the college classroom, the masculine traits are often honored and revered (Higginbotham, 1990). Philbin, Meier, Huffman and Boverie (1995) describe a masculine bias present in most traditional educational curricula and teaching methodologies. Feminist pedagogy experts (Beckman, 1991; Dunn, 1993; Schniedewind, 1993: Shrewsbury, 1993; Wood, 1993) believe that an inclusionary classroom can foster a productive learning environment for women and men.

Research Questions

In order to develop a plan for the inclusion of gender communication content and gender-fair teaching methods into the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec, the following research questions were identified:

1. What does the literature yield regarding gender differences in public speaking behavior?

2. What does the literature yield regarding women's preferred styles of learning?

3. What does the literature yield regarding public speaking instruction at institutions of higher education and the inclusion of women's styles of learning?

4. What teaching methodologies have been identified in the literature which would address women's preferred styles of learning?

5. What are the essential steps for developing recommendations to the Communications Department Chair that will facilitate the integration of gender communication content and inclusive teaching methodologies in the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec?

Definition of Terms

Androcentric. This term refers to the male-centerness of research materials such as academic literature, textbooks, and tradebooks.

Curriculum plan. An academic plan at St. Louis Community College-Meramec incorporating departmental needs, concerns, and requirements to produce courses and programs.

Feminist pedagogy. This term refers to a type of inclusive teaching methodology which incorporates collaborative learning, interdependence, and shared responsibility.

Gender. This term refers to the psychological attributes of masculinity and femininity, not related to biological sex.

Gender communication. This type of communication refers to the way males and females communicate.

Gender-fair. This term refers to course materials and teaching methodologies which are inclusive of all students, and which allow equal representation of male and female attitudes, beliefs, and values.

Gender stereotype. This term refers to a group of traits and roles generally attributed to either men or women.

Inclusive teaching methodologies. These methodologies consist of instructional strategies which are fair to all students by acknowledging diversity in the classroom environment.

Learning styles. This term refers to an individual's characteristic and preferred ways of gathering, interpreting, organizing, and thinking about information.

Public address. These are types of academic courses involved in the rhetorical analysis of historical and contemporary public speeches.

Public speaking. This is a special form of communication, usually more formal, planned and organized than other communication exchanges and usually involves one speaker communicating to a large audience.

Transfer institutions. Transfer institutions are four-year universities and colleges to which community college students transfer community college credits in order to continue in college and obtain a four-year degree.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Methodology

A developmental problem solving methodology was used to formulate a plan for incorporating gender communication content and gender-fair teaching methodologies into the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec.

Procedures

Five procedures were followed in order to respond to the five research questions. First, a series of literature reviews were conducted. Second, an analysis of public speaking materials and the instructional methods presently used in the communications classes at SLCC-Meramec was analyzed. Third, a questionnaire was developed and distributed to male and female professional speakers in the St. Louis area related to how men and women were trained and want to be trained as speakers. Fourth, in-depth interviews were conducted with 15 subjects to solicit more information determining male and female speaking styles, preference for public speaking instruction, and gender differences affecting public speaking styles. Fifth, the plan for

initiating changes in the public speaking course was developed and presented to the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec.

The first procedure consisted of the completion of a series of reviews of literature. The reviews of literature were designed to answer the following four research questions: (a) What does the literature yield regarding gender differences in public speaking behavior? (b) What does the literature yield regarding women's preferred styles of learning? (c) What does the literature yield regarding public speaking instruction at institutions of higher education and the inclusion of women's styles of learning? (d) What teaching methodologies have been identified in the literature which would address women's preferred styles of learning?

The topics for these literature reviews were as follows: (a) gender differences in public speaking, (b) public speaking instruction, (c) learning styles and gender, (d) inclusive teaching methodologies, and (e) curriculum revision plans. The literature search was conducted using the databases of ERIC, psycLIT, Expanded Academic ASAD, Infotrac, National Newspaper Index, and ABI/Inform. Search words included, gender differences in communication style, sex differences, male/female communication, cognitive/learning styles, questionnaire design, survey development, public speaking instruction, feminist pedagogy, instructional strategies, curriculum design/revision, strategic planning, and evaluation. The reviews of literature combined research from the field of education, including classroom instructional strategies, curriculum design, and administration, and from communication studies, such as gender differences and public speaking instruction.

An extensive bibliography was developed from sources such as academic journals (i.e., Communication Education, ERIC documents, Sex Roles, Communication Monographs, Women's Studies Quarterly, and other communication, education, and psychology journals), tradebooks, college textbooks, convention papers, dissertations, published information, and material located on-line, such as the INTERNET.

The second procedure consisted of the completion of an analysis of public speaking materials and the instructional methods presently used in the communications classes at SLCC-Meramec. The analysis of the public speaking texts and tradebooks was designed to answer the third research question, What does the literature yield regarding public speaking instruction at institutions of higher education and the inclusion of woemn's styles of learning?

Public speaking texts and tradebooks were analyzed regarding their inclusion of gender communication. A total of 92 public speaking textbooks and tradebooks were analyzed on five criteria. Texts were obtained through the SLCC-Meramec library and bookstore, area university and public libraries, and local bookstores. Public speaking anthologies and public speaking texts written for academia and the general public were selected. Texts written as early as 1936 until the present were chosen for analysis. Approximately 25 texts have been used or are currently in use at SLCC-Meramec.

Each text was analyzed regarding five coding categories: (a) reference to "gender" in the index, (b) ratio of female versus male speech examples, (c) multi-cultural reference, (d) mention of gender differences in language, and (e) reference to gender as part of audience demographics. The table of contents, index, and specific chapters from each text were analyzed for reference to gender, particularly citations of

female speakers and female speech examples. A table listing each book along with the five coding categories was developed, and indicators were placed on the grid to signify a gender reference.

The third procedure consisted of the completion of a questionnaire. The development and distribution of the questionnaire was designed to answer the fourth research question, What teaching methodologies have been identified in the literature which would address women's preferred styles of learning?

The questionnaire was developed and distributed to male and female professional speakers in the St. Louis area and related to how men and women were trained and want to be trained as speakers. The questionnaire was specifically distributed to St. Louis area members of the National Speakers Association, Toastmasters organizations, college and university educators, and professional speakers. Fifty members attending the National Speakers Association and Toastmasters meetings were asked to participate in the project. They received a copy of the questionnaire and were asked to complete the survey in the presence of the researcher. The educators and professional speakers were asked to participate in the project through the use of a cover letter requesting their participation. Communications, Foreign Language, and Theatre professors at SLCC-Meramec, and Management and Communications faculty members at Concordia University-Wisconsin St. Louis Center (CUW) were asked to participate in the study. These two academic populations were selected because they are diverse and represent two distinct target student groups. Faculty members at SLCC-Meramec are responsible for teaching community college students, whereas CUW-St. Louis Center faculty members are responsible for teaching

adult students. A total of 49 SLCC-Meramec faculty and 28 CUW-St. Louis Center faculty were asked to complete the questionnaire.

Participants were chosen from membership records of the St. Louis Chapter of the American Society of Training and Development (ASTD), National Speakers Association, and Toastmasters organizations. Approximately 25 participants came from this participant pool.

The questionnaire was developed using standard question-writing techniques. Generally, the most effective questions are worded as simply as possible (Berdie, Anderson, & Neibuhr, 1986). Schumacher and McMillan (1993) provide suggestions about writing questions. Besides making the items clear and concise, these authors believe the questions should also be relevant, simple, unbiased, and written in a neutral way. Focus, brevity, and clarity are of prime importance according to Alreck and Settle (1985). Developers of questionnaires should avoid ambiguous questions, multi-purpose questions, biased wording, inappropriate emphasis, and manipulative questioning (Rea & Parker, 1992).

Answers to survey questions typically require the respondent to make a choice along a continuum, select the most appropriate choice, or rank items. All of these methods refer to the scaling of questions. A scale is a series of gradations, levels, or values that describe various degrees of something (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). The Likert, semantic differential, and the adjective check list are a variety of the scaling methods used in many questionnaires.

Questionnaires should be developed which are functional and pleasing to the eye. A general principle to follow in formatting a questionnaire is that the respondent's

needs must always receive top priority, the interviewer should next highest priority, and data processing staff should receive the lowest priority (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982, p. 229).

The questionnaire should follow a very specific order, particularly when it is a mailed survey opposed to an interview administered survey. The better organized the questionnaire the more likely the respondent will be able to finish the questionnaire in a reasonable amount of time. It has been erroneously believed that the shorter the questionnaire, the higher the response rate. However, current studies suggest that no correlation between length of questionnaire and response rate exists (Berdie, et al., 1986). Generally, it is advisable to make the questionnaire meaningful, rather than short. Alreck and Settle (1985) believe that the initial part of the questionnaire should include the most general questions. If a potential respondent agrees to participate promptly when the survey is introduced, only a very small percentage will withdraw their cooperation later (Alreck & Settle).

Validity and reliability are two paramount concerns in questionnaire design. Before a pilot or field test is implemented, the Learning Activity Packet (Nova Southeastern University, 1993) suggests that an expert panel consisting of questionnaire design experts and/or content experts analyze the questionnaire and evaluate the contents. After this step, the questionnaire is ready to be field tested. A pilot test of the questionnaire often aids in the assurance of validity and reliability.

The questionnaire was reviewed by two expert panels to establish validity, reliability of content, and clarity of the questions. The panel consisted of three members of the SLCC-Meramec Communications Department and one educator from

another institution. Committee participants suggested that the first draft of the questionnaire required four changes to be made. First, six questions from the first draft of the questionnaire needed to be rewritten or organized in a different manner. Second, "Don't remember" was added as a third response option for the first question. Third, a grammatical error in the introduction of the questionnaire needed to be corrected. Fourth, the recommendation to organize the questionnaire into three parts was suggested.

In addition, the reliability of the questionnaire was determined by a pilot test conducted by a panel of six faculty members from the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec. Pilot study participants suggested that the questionnaire necessitated two changes. First, two question required rewriting. Second, the statements of "Don't remember" and "Depends on context" were added as options to two questions.

The fourth procedure consisted of the completion of in-depth interviews. The development of the interview was designed to also answer the fourth research question, What teaching methodologies have been identified in the literature which would address women's preferred styles of learning?

In-depth interviews were conducted with 15 subjects to solicit more information determining male and female speaking styles, preference for public speaking instruction, and gender differences affecting public speaking styles. The purpose of the interviews was to gather additional data regarding how men and women evaluate their public speaking instruction and experiences. The researcher used a personal-interview format, including an interview guide to ensure uniformity. A series of closed, open, and follow-up questions was included for each of the three sections of the interview. Each

interview was tape-recorded, and responses were recorded on the interview guide by the researcher. Each interview took place at a location determined accessible by both parties, and the decision was achieved by mutual consent. Participants in the interviews were notified that their interview would last no longer than one hour.

The interview guide was developed using standard question-writing techniques. The interview is essentially a vocal questionnaire, yet it results in a higher response rate than questionnaires (Schumacher & McMillan , 1993). Hamilton (1987) states, "[Interviews] can improve the communication climate by fostering the perception that something is being done which is worth doing and in which everyone is invited to contribute" (p. 76). The purposes of the interview are to explore variables in the research project, to supplement other methods, follow up unexpected results, and/or validate other methods of research (Issac & Michael, 1981).

A variety of interview structures exist, from the unstructured interview resembling a conversation, to the more structured interview similar to a well-defined structure and resembling an objective questionnaire. Schumacher and McMillan (1993) believe that standardized open-ended interviews reduce interviewer effects and bias. For example, this type of interview, participants are asked the same questions in the same order (p. 426). The interview schedule lists in order all the questions which will be asked and allows for the interviewer to write answers on the interview form.

Schumacher and McMillan (1993) state that preparing an interview guide includes justification, defining objectives, writing questions, deciding general and item format, and pretesting (p. 250). The interview should be simple and objective. After the questions have been written, the questions must be pretested to check for bias. Issac

and Michael (1981) state that an interviewer should develop a tentative guide to be used during the interview and should also develop a satisfactory method of coding and recording responses. Hamilton (1987) believes that the first part of the interview should establish basic information, such as demographic data.

The recording of responses usually is completed in one of two ways, by tape-recording or by means of written notes (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). Two types of note-taking exists. The first method involves the interviewer taking verbatim notes. The second method involves the interviewer waiting until the interview is over and reconstructing the answer to each question. Schumacher and McMillan believe that most interviewers "compromise between these extremes" (p. 254). Hamilton also states that the interviewer should keep to the factual, and should use a variety of the questions from the formal written questionnaire in the interview. This allows the interviewer to gain more detail, since "people will often talk freely when they will refrain from writing" (p. 75). Finally, the interviewer should thank the respondents for their time.

Participants in the in-depth interviews included male and female non-experienced and experienced public speakers. A total of 15 individuals (8 male and 7 female) were asked to participate in the interviews. Each interview was designed to gather information from novice and professional speakers. Non-experienced speakers were those individuals who had delivered up to three speeches in public; however, emphasis was placed on those who did not deliver a speech in public. Experienced speakers were those individuals who have delivered more than three speeches in public, who routinely speak in public, or who receive remuneration to speak in public.

The fifth procedure consisted of the completion of a plan for initiating changes in the public speaking course. The plan was developed and presented to the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec. The development of the plan was designed to answer the firth research question, What are the essential steps for developing recommendations to the Communications Department Chair that will facilitate the integration of gender communication content and inclusive teaching methodologies in the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec?

The plan was developed by compiling the conclusions drawn from the series of reviews of literature and the data collected from the analysis of the public speaking textbooks and tradebooks, questionnaires, and interviews. Research has shown that seven criteria must be met before an educational program can be deemed one of high quality (Bergquist & Armstrong, 1986). The first five criteria relate to the characteristics of the program, while the remaining two focus on the characteristics of the learner. A educational program should be attractive to the needs and interests of the targeted population and should provide benefits to the community and society. The educational program should also deliver what it intends to deliver and be distinctive by not merely being a copy of another program which was successful somewhere else. A program can only be considered quality if and when the learning outcomes have been met, documented, and communicated. "The ultimate test of effectiveness is how the program meets the needs of and produces desirable change in the current or potential students it intends to serve" (Bergquist & Armstrong, p. 5).

Diamond (1989) believes several conditions must be met in order for significant academic improvements to occur. Faculty must have ownership, and possess

academic administrative support in the process. A support team should be put in place for the planning and implementation of the program. Diamond argues, "Evaluation must be an integral part of the process . . ."(p. 2).

Program development literature stresses the importance of utilizing multiple criteria for accessing the merit of a program or activity (Davis, 1989). Methods which have been used in evaluation include tests, surveys, interviews, and observations using experimental and quasi-experimental designs (Davis, p. 17). Schumacher and McMillan (1993) include tests, questionnaires, self-report devices, rating scales, observation systems, and interview schedules as instruments used in the program develop and evaluation process. A review of the research and feedback from the evaluation committees indicated that the plan should consist of four parts: a reference manual, a guide, outlines for three two-hour departmental workshops, and an outline for a campus-wide staff development workshop. The plan will be responsible for the following reasons: (a) providing knowledge to the Communications Department in the form of written materials, (b) supplying direction and leadership through the departmental workshops, and (c) creating awareness at the campus level through the campus-wide staff-development program.

Formative and summative evaluation committees guided the development of the plan. Scrivin (cited in Schumacher & McMillan, 1993) discriminated between formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation involves researchers collecting data to modify or revise a curriculum in its developmental stage. It is often used for the purpose of improving and developing a program, activity, or product (Davis, 1989).

Usually the audience for such an evaluation is the program personnel. The formative evaluation is typically conducted by an internal evaluator.

A formative evaluation committee acted in an advisory manner for this project. The advisory committee consisted of faculty members within the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec. Although committee members determined that the material included in the plan would be appropriate to the institution and the content valid, three recommendations were made. First, committee members suggested that Workshops 1 and 3 of the plan could be presented at combinted meetings of the Oral Communications and Public Speaking committees. Second, workshop 2 could be presented at full departmental meetings including all Communications faculty. Third, the plan should be presented along with information such as assessment, integration of academics, general education, career studies, and reading and study skills.

The role of summative evaluation is to determine the effectiveness of a program considering other competing programs. Accountability or resource allocation issues usually require the use of summative evaluation (Davis, 1989). Potential users of the program, product, or procedure is the intended audience of summative evaluation (Schumacher & McMillan). Usually external evaluators are used for a summative evaluation.

A summative evaluation committee consisting of content experts in the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec provided information on content validity and the feasibility of implementing the plan. All three committee members believed the plan provided a clear, cohesive, common vision and delineation of the public speaking course and the integration of inclusive teaching methodologies, and

that the material would be of strong importance to faculty campus-wide. Three recommendations were posited. First, the committee suggested that the plan be considered for adoption at all three campuses. Second, the professional development committee on the Meramec campus should consider the implementation of this plan since learning styles and inclusive teachign methodologies belong in the context of professional development. Third, the Communications Department Chair may further recommend that all communications courses adopt the curriculum and use gender-fair teaching methodologies.

The evaluation of the plan was developed using standard program evaluation techniques. Evaluation is seen as providing "feedback leading to a successful outcome defined in practical, concrete terms" (Isaac & Michael, 1981, p. 2). Evaluation is generally used in a broader context which goes beyond students' learning and development (Erwin, 1991). As defined by the Joint Committee (1981) representing twelve organizations, "evaluation is the process of determining worth or merit of an activity, program, person or product" (Davis, 1989, p. 7). The intended audiences of evaluation are often decision makers and program participants.

In order for the evaluation information to be useful, Davis (1989) determined through a review of evaluation literature that seven conditions should be met. First, opportunities for the client and evaluator to discuss findings should be available. Second, key administrators should support the evaluation process. Third, checks should be in place to make sure the information is valid, credible, and reliable. Fourth, recommendations should be written explicitly. Fifth, reports should be brief and address the client's concerns. Sixth, results of the evaluation should be published in a

timely manner. Finally, one or more individuals should be identified to provide leadership for the implementation of the suggestions.

Since the early 1970's evaluators have been considering the importance of including race, ethnicity, and gender within the education program planning and evaluation process (Beaudry, 1992). Therefore the idea of including different voices in the evaluation process is not a novel one. ". . . Evaluation process must seek to include the multiple perspectives of ethnicity, race, gender, and social class" (Beaudry, p. 69). Gender and social class issues must be represented in both the design and evaluation of educational programs (Beaudry). Yet a review of literature conducted by Grant and Sleeter determined gender and social class were issues that were often not integrated into both program planning and evaluation (cited in Madison, 1992). Madison warns evaluators that the evaluation process should be involved in primary inclusion. Primary inclusion refers to the "direct participation of program participants in all phases of program development, from the conceptualization of problems to the evaluation and the interpretation of findings" (Madison, p. 36).

Issac and Michael (1981) remind evaluators to develop measures that have the best fit with the program objectives. Assessment literature recommends that faculty become involved in each step of the evaluation process. Other researchers (Davis, 1989) recommend a team approach to evaluation.

Assumptions

In the development of this project, the following five assumptions were made.

1. The literature searches conducted for this project are assumed to be appropriate, accurate, and representative of scholarship, particularly in the areas of

gender differences in public speaking behavior, curriculum revision and inclusive teaching methodologies.

2. The analysis of 92 public speaking textbooks and tradebooks is assumed to be indicative of the content included in public speaking materials utilized in instruction and which are available to the general public.

3. The questionnaires were answered thoroughly and accurately by the respondents.

4. The follow-up interviews provided honest and sincere answers from the respondents.

5. The information provided by the advisory, formative, and summative committee members is assumed to be thorough and accurate.

Limitations

The following are limitations of this study.

1. The plan applies only to the Communications Department at St. Louis Community College-Meramec. It may not be possible to extrapolate the information for use as a plan or model for other departments at the college or at other institutions.

2. The reliability of the questionnaire and the interviews to determine gender differences in public speaking and the preferred method of instruction is limited to the expertise of the advisory committee in consultation with the writer of the project.

3. The validity of the questionnaire and interview data is limited to the expertise of the formative and summative committee members in consultation with the writer of the project.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

The purpose of this project was to investigate gender differences in public speaking behavior and to develop a plan which includes gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies for the public speaking class at SLCC-Meramec. Collett and Serrano (1992), Snyder and Hoffman (1993), Townsend (1995), and Twombly (1993) indicate that women are becoming the majority of community college students. SLCC-Meramec's enrollment reflects the research with a student body that is 59% female. Classroom-participation research (Gerlach & Hart, 1992; Karabenick & Sharma, 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1992) indicates that classroom interaction patterns, classroom climate, and curricular content tend to create an environment that excludes women. Studies by Kelly (1991) and Pearson and West (1991) indicate that female students' behaviors are often discredited in the classroom.

Carli, LaFleur and Loeber (1995), Kearney and Plax (1996), Kramarae (1981), and Tannen (1990) assert that men and women maintain separate and distinct public speaking styles. Language (Mulac & Lundell, 1994), humor (Arliss, 1991), nonverbal communication (Knapp & Hall, 1992), influence and persausibility (Carli et al.), evaluation (Clark, 1993) and listening behavior (Tannen, 1990) show gender differences significant enough to create stereotypes and accepted models of communication behavior.

Survey results from 139 respondents indicate that 78.4% believe gender differences in public speaking behavior exist. Respondents believe that gender differences exist in each of the 13 areas listed in the questionnaire, including nonverbal

communication, credibility, listening, speech organization, and evaluation. Approximately 67% of the survey respondents did not believe women's issues were addressed in the public speaking course. A total of 52.8% of respondents agreed that women's preferred learning styles were not a part of the public speaking classroom. A majority of the respondents (62.8%) believed that the method of instruction used in the public speaking course affected the degree of gender differences present in the classroom.

Respondents suggested that more examples of female speakers, different speech assignments, and collaborative learning opportunities would create a classroom environment more accepting of women. A total of 72.5% of the respondents indicated that they would prefer collaborative learning opportunities in the public speaking course.

Interview respondents reported that a majority believed their public speaking style reflected their gender. When the 15 interview participants were asked to determine if male and female public speaking styles existed, a total of 12 believed different styles were prevalent. A majority of the respondents agreed that society does not accept both male and female speakers equally. Male and female interview respondents agreed on the elements of an ideal public speaking classroom and the characteristics of the ideal public speaking instructor. Fourteen of the 15 respondents agreed that gender differences in public speaking behavior should be discussed and explored more fully by researchers and practitioners.

Textbooks have consistently ignored the discoveries of females, and continue to present a majority of male examples (Ferree & Hall; 1990; Ivy & Backlund, 1994; Peterson & Kroner, 1992; Wood, 1994). An analysis of 92 public speaking textbooks

and tradebooks indicates that references to gender specific behavior is consistently absent. Results from this analysis of public speaking textbooks and tradebooks indicate that students of public speaking may be receiving gender biased information, because the content of these texts appears to be exclude women and other groups.

In order to address the gender differences in public speaking behavior and create an inclusive climate for male and female students, a plan was developed for the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec. An advisory committee was selected to provide leadership and guide the plan towards implementation. A summative committee of content specialists validated the plan for content and implementation feasibility.

The development of the plan focused on the following: (a) identifying gender differences in public speaking behavior, (b) reporting on the classroom climate, (c) determining learning styles of males and females, (d) providing inclusive teaching methodologies, and (e) finding appropriate strategies for integrating gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies into the public speaking course.

The information from this research was analyzed and a reference manual, guide, three two-hour workshops, and one campus-wide staff development program were developed. The reference manual contains a compilation of research materials concerning men's and women's public speaking styles and inclusive teaching methodologies. The guide provides gender communication materials within the context of public speaking, including curriculum-revision plans.

The first workshop is to provide a common base of knowledge of gender differences in public speaking behavior. The second workshop is to allow participants

to understand learning styles in general and women's preferred styles of learning. The third workshop is to identify the strategies which can be implemented to address women's preferred styles of learning, and incorporate gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies in the public speaking course. The purpose of the campus-wide staff-development program is to increase faculty's awareness of gender communication research and inclusive teaching methodologies and to aid them in implementing gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies within their own courses.

Conclusions

The conclusions that can be drawn from the answers to the first research question, What does the literature yield regarding gender differences in public speaking behavior?, are as follows: (a) men and women possess different public speaking styles, (b) society accepts the male model of speaking, (c) men and women organize speech material differently, (d) men utilize an instrumental style of language whereas women apply an expressive style, (e) men and women use nonverbal communication differently, (f) men have a greater chance of influencing the audience than women, (g) women evaluate themselves more harshly than men, and (h) men receive more favorable evaluations than women.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the answers to the second research question, What does the literature yield regarding women's preferred styles of learning?, are as follows: (a) men and women possess separate and distinct learning styles, (b) women prefer a relational and "connected knowing" paradigm, (c) traditional

education supports the male model of learning, and (d) feminist pedagogy supports the female model of learning.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the answers to the third research question, What does the literature yield regarding public speaking instruction at institutions of higher education and the inclusion of women's styles of learning?, are as follows: (a) an androcentric bias exists in public speaking course content, (b) textbooks include more examples of male speakers than female speakers, (c) a need exists for inclusive instructional strategies, and (d) curriculum revision plans provide examples for transforming the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the answers to the fourth research question, What teaching methodologies have been identified in the literature which would address women's preferred styles of learning?, are as follows: (a) collaboration, non-competitive discussion strategies, and interactive teaching methodologies were identified as complementary to women's preferred learning styles, (b) feminist pedagogy was identified as enhancing women's style of learning, and (c) cooperative learning was found to be an inclusive instructional strategy conducive to women's ways of learning.

Conclusions reached from the survey are as follows: (a) the public speaking course does not use women's preferred styles of learning (i.e., cooperative, inclusive) nor does it include issues related to women or multi-culturalism, (b) men and women should not receive instruction in public speaking targeted to a specific gender, (c) men and women believe the public speaking course could be more accepting of women and women's preferred styles of learning, (d) men and women agree that gender

differences exist in public speaking behavior, (e) men and women are evaluated differently by peers, (f) men and women are not evaluated differently by instructors, (g) men and women do not evaluate themselves differently, (h) societal stereotypes are the primary reason for gender differences in public speaking behavior, (i) the method of instruction and the gender of the instructor can affect the degree of gender differences in the classroom, and (j) speakers and educators should be responsible for dealing with gender differences in public speaking behavior.

Conclusions reached from the interviews are as follows: (a) a majority of men and women would like to change their public speaking style, (b) a majority of men and women report that their public speaking style reflects their gender, (c) men and women believe socially desired public speaking styles exist, (d) men and women agree on descriptions of the ideal public speaking classroom and the ideal public speaking instructor, (e) men and women indicate that an unequal representation of male and female speech examples exist, (f) a majority of men and women agree that men and women possess different public speaking styles, and (g) a majority of men and women believe that society does not accept both male and female speakers equally. The conclusions that can be drawn from the answers to the fifth research question, What are the essential steps for developing recommendations to the Communications Department Chair that will facilitate the integration of gender communication content and inclusive teaching methodologies in the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec?, are as follows: (a) curriculum-transformation programs provide examples for integrating gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies into the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec, (b) faculty should become the primary source of

curriculum revision projects, and (c) a plan to incorporate gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies at SLCC-Meramec should include the development of a manual, report, three departmental workshops, and a campus-wide staff-development program.

St. Louis Community College-Meramec continues to impress upon its faculty, through its mission statement, district-wide strategic plans and staff-development programs, the need for continuous improvement of teaching strategies, and the inclusion of all students on campus within its curriculum. This project of teaching faculty how to incorporate gender-fair content within the public speaking course and possibly within other communication courses and to begin using inclusive teaching methodologies, is one of the first steps towards achieving this goal. Developing inclusive teaching methodologies, based on a firm theoretical foundation established by experts in feminist pedagogy and cooperative learning, may prove to be an additional step in the direction of diversity education and fostering collaboration and cooperation among students and faculty alike. How we communicate is as important as what we communicate. Therefore, it is imperative that faculty members begin to incorporate in the classroom environment how men and women communicate along with how they each learn. It is important that all students have an equal voice in the classroom.

Implications

Four implications resulted from this project. The following implications have the potential to affect the student, faculty, and administrative populations at SLCC-Meramec.

1. The materials generated from the extensive literature reviews could provide faculty members with relevant content information regarding gender differences in public speaking behavior, learning styles, inclusive pedagogy, inclusive teaching methodologies, and curriculum-revision plans. The outline of the manual, presented to the Communications Department, includes such elements as bibliographies, summaries of gender differences in communication and pedagogical research articles, strategies for implementing inclusive teaching methodologies, and suggestions for incorporating feminist pedagogy in the classroom. The faculty manual could impact instruction in courses such as public speaking, oral communications, and other courses which require public presentation. Thus, students enrolled in communications courses at SLCC-Meramec may be recipients of beginning attempts at curriculum revision.

2. Results from the reviews of literature regarding traditional public speaking course content and instructional methodologoies revealed that a need exists for inclusive instructional strategies to be implemented within the public speaking course. An outline of a report analyzing gender communication materials within the context of public speaking was developed. As a result, when this report is presented to the Communications Department faculty, instructors at SLCC-Meramec could begin to incorporate the research materials into course planning, syllabus preparation, and the selection of teaching methodologies in a variety of courses, particularly Public Speaking (COM 107), Male/Female Communication (COM 511), and Oral Communication (COM 101). Information obtained from the results of the questionnaire and the interviews could provide Communications faculty with information relevant to the SLCC-Meramec

campus. Communications students could benefit from improvements in course planning and syllabus preparation.

3. A combination of the reviews of literature and the results from the questionnaire and the interviews resulted in the development of a plan to implement three two-hour training sessions to help Communications Department faculty acquire knowledge in inclusive teaching methodologies, feminist pedagogy, and women's scholarship. Each two-hour workshop contains specific goals and objectives. Participation in one or more of these workshops could provide Communications faculty members with the necessary materials to begin implementation of gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies in their own classrooms.

4. Conclusions reached from the results of the questionnaire and the interviews provided the material for an outline of a staff-development workshop for the entire campus on the topic of gender communication and inclusive teaching methodologies. It is not within the scope of this project to anticipate college-wide curriculum reform; however, faculty members could become aware of the impact of gender in the classroom and develop strategies to include women's preferred learning styles. SLCC-Meramec administrators may be prompted to actively consider future staff-development programs emphasizing gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies.

Recommendations

In order to implement the plan to incorporate gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies within the public speaking course at SLCC-Meramec, departmental and institutional support must be established. The Communications Department Chair, Assistant Department Chair, and advisory committees will guide the

plan towards implementation at the departmental level. Ancillary aspects of implementation include securing funding and evaluating the project.

Recommendations for Implementation

The implementation of this plan for the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec consists of nine steps.

1. The Communications Department Chair requires the lead faculty member of the public speaking course to provide evidence that supports the need to revise the course content and instructional methodology of the public speaking course. Evidence consists of data from the analyses of the Program Evaluations for 1990 and 1993, public speaking enrollment trends, preliminary results from the Task Force on General Education Reform, data from the 1995 survey conducted by the Speech Communication Association (SCA), and the reviews of literature expressing the need for public speaking curriculum revision. Evidence presented in report form will be later included in the handouts developed for use in the departmental workshops.

2. A committee composed of the Communications Department Chair, Assistant Chair, and the public speaking lead faculty member will establish an ad hoc group of three full-time faculty members to gather additional information and resources on non-biased public speaking course content and inclusive teaching methodologies.

3. The public speaking lead faculty member will develop a reference manual describing gender differences in public speaking behavior and outlining inclusive teaching methodologies.

4. The committee will draft a memo to be distributed to all full and part-time Communications Department faculty members requesting feedback and concerns

about the planned curriculum revision of the public speaking course. A formative evaluation committee will be established to act in an advisory manner. This advisory committee will be composed of faculty members within the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec. This advisory committee will provide the necessary direction and leadership as well as demonstrate the department's commitment to the project.

5. The committee will analyze the additional information provided by faculty members and discusses implementation of the plan. A revision of the plan may result from faculty members' comments. A summative evaluation committee consisting of content experts in the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec will provide information on content validity and the feasibility of implementing the plan.

6. The Communications Department Chair approves the plan or requests a revision of the plan.

7. If the plan is adopted, the Communications Department Chair will request the lead faculty member to develop three departmental level staff-development workshops to inform full and part-time faculty of the revised public speaking curriculum. The advisory committee will also provide the necessary encouragement to nurture active participation.

8. After a one-semester trial of the revised curriculum, the plan will be reassessed. Upon completion of the pilot study, an analysis should identify any problems and should facilitate appropriate changes or restructuring of the plan. If the assessment by the Communications Department Chair and Assistant Department Chair determines the project is successful, the Communications Department Chair may

recommend that all communications courses adopt the curriculum and implement inclusive teaching methodologies.

9. The Communications Department Chair and Assistant Department Chair may recommend to the Associate Dean of Communications and Mathematics that the project be implemented on a campus-wide level.

An important aspect of implementation is the exploration of internal and external funding sources for the development of departmental workshops, manuals, reports, and possibly, campus-wide staff-development workshops. SLCC-Meramec does award extended and release time awards for faculty development, and this could provide the initial support for implementation. Campus-wide staff-development funds could be secured, if the funding proposal for the project would receive support from the staff-development funding committee. Each staff development funding proposal is competitively assessed each semester, and monetary allowances are awarded to worthy projects.

In order to evaluate the results of the implementation of the plan, it is recommended that participants in the departmental workshops evaluate each of the three workshop sessions, and evaluate the ancillary handout materials. It is also recommended that student evaluations of the public speaking course be monitored.

Recommendations for Dissemination

This plan will be presented to the Communications Department Chair, Assistant Department Chair, Associate Dean of Mathematics and Communication, and all full-time Communications Department faculty members. As a result of the plan being presented to the Associate Dean of Mathematics and Communications, this plan might

also eventually be presented to all SLCC-Meramec full-time faculty as part of a staff-development program. The results of this plan will be presented at an upcoming annual meeting of the Organization for the Study of Communication, Language, and Gender (OSCLG). The report will also be presented as an entry for the Cheris Kramarae Dissertation Award presented through the Organization for the Study of Communication, Language, and Gender. Based on the results of this plan, a paper will be presented to the Speech Communication Association (SCA) Convention review board for possible acceptance as a convention paper at the annual meeting. Further dissemination should also include presentations at professional meetings that focus on women's issues and curriculum reform. Finally, the results of this plan should be submitted to journals such as Communication Education, Psychology of Women Quarterly, Women Studies in Communication, and Women's Studies Quarterly.

Recommendations for Further Research

Once the Communications Department at SLCC-Meramec has integrated gender-fair content and inclusive teaching methodologies into the public speaking course, further research is recommended to determine if the plan can be adapted to other communication courses within the department. Additional study should be undertaken to ascertain whether the plan can be implemented within other departments at the college. Further research is also recommended to determine if the plan can be implemented in settings other than SLCC-Meramec.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, M. (1992). Cultural inclusion in the American college classroom. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 49, 5-17.

Aitken, J. E., & Neer, M. R. (1991). Variables associated with question-asking in the college classroom. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.

Allen, B. P., & Niss, J. F. (1990). A chill in the college classroom? Phi Delta Kappan, 607-609.

Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1985). The survey research handbook. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

American Association of University Women (1992). AAUW report: How schools shortchange girls. Report by the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women. Wellesley, MA: Publications Department.

Ames, R., & Lau, S. (1982). An attributional analysis of student help-seeking in academic setting. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 414-423.

Anderson, J. A., & Adams, M. (1992). Acknowledging the learning styles of diverse student populations: Implications for instructional design. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 49, 19-33.

Andrews, P. H. (1987). Gender differences in persuaisve communication and attribution of success and failure. Human Communication Research, 13, 372-385.

Andrews, R. (1990). The development of a learning styles program in a low socioeconomic underachieving North Carolina elementary school. Journal of Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities: International, 6(3), 307-314.

Arliss, L. P. (1991). Gender communication. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Association of American Colleges (1982). Liberal education and the new scholarship on women. Project of the Status and Education of Women. Washington, DC.

Austin, A. E., & Baldwin, R. C. (Eds.). (1991). Enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Avery, P. G., & Walker, C. (1993). Prospective teachers' perceptions of ethnic and gender differences in academic achievement. Journal of Teacher Education, 44(1), 27-37.

Badini, A. A., & Rosenthal, R. (1989). Visual cues, student sex, material taught, and the magnitude of teacher expectancy effects. Communication Education, 38, 162-166.

Banyard, V. L., & Graham-Bermann, S. A. (1993). Can women cope? A gender analysis of theories of coping with stress. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 17, 303-318.

Basow, S. A. (1992). Gender: Stereotypes and roles (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Rooks/Cole.

Basow, S. A., & Silberg, N. T. (1987). Student evaluations of college professors: Are female and male professors rated differently? Journal of Educational Psychology, 79, 308-314.

Bate, B. (1988). Communication and the sexes. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Baxter-Magolda, M. B. (1992). Knowing and reasoning in college: Gender-related patterns in students' intellectual development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beaudry, J. S. (1992). Synthesizing research in multicultural teacher education: Findings and issues for evaluation of cultural diversity. In A. M. Madison (Ed.), Minority issues in program evaluation: New Directions for Program Evaluation, 53. (pp. 69-86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Beck, E. T., Greer, S. C., Jackson, D. R., & Schmitz, B. (1990). The feminist transformation of a university: A case study. Women's Studies Quarterly, 1-2, 174-188.

Beckman, M. (1991). Feminist teaching methods and the team-based workplace: Do results match intentions? Women's Studies Quarterly, 1-2, 165-178.

Beebe, S. A., & Beebe, S. J. (1991). Public speaking: An audience-centered approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bennett, R. E., Gottesman, R. L., Rock, D. A., & Cerullo, F. (1993). Influence of behavior perceptions and gender on teachers' judgments of students' academic skill. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85(2), 347-356.

Bennett, S. K. (1982). Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence relating to questions of gender bias in teaching evaluation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74(2), 170-179.

Benz, C. R., Pfeiffer, I., & Newman, I. (1981). Sex role expectations of classroom teachers, grades 1-12. American Educational Research Journal, 18, 289-302.

Berdie, D. R., Anderson, J. F., & Niebuhr, M. A. (1986). Questionnaire: Design and use (2nd ed.). Metuchen, NJ.: Scarecrow Press.

Berger, J., Wagner, D. G., & Zelditch, Jr. (1985). Introduction: Expectations states theory. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch, Jr. (Eds.), Status, rewards, and influence (pp. 1-72). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bergquist, W. H., & Armstrong, J. L. (1986). Planning effectively for educational quality. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Berry, E. (April, 1989). Taking women professors seriously. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, San Francisco, CA.

Beyer, S. (1990). Gender differences in the accuracy of self-evaluations of performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 960-970.

Bezucha, R. J. (1985). Feminist pedagogy as a subversive activity. In M. Culley & C. Portuges (Eds.), Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching (pp. 81-95). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Biernat, M. (1991). Gender stereotypes and the relationship between masculinity and femininity: A developmental analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61(3), 351-365.

Blum, D. E. (1991, October). Environment still hostile to women in academe, new evidence suggests. The Chronical of Higher Education, 38, A1-3.

Borden, W., & Berlin, S. (1990). Gender, coping and psychological well-being in spouses of older adults with chronic dementia. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 60, 603-610.

Borisoff, D., & Merrill, L. (1992). The power to communicate: Gender differences as barriers (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Bowen, S. P., & Wyatt, N. J. (Eds.). (1993). Transforming visions: Feminist critiques of speech communication. Cresskill, NY: Hampton Press.

Bradburn, N. M., & Sudman, S. (1979). Improving interview method and questionnaire design. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bridges, D. (1988). A philosophical analysis of discussion. In J. T. Dillon (Ed.), Questioning and disucssion: A multidisciplinary study (pp. 128-143). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bridges, J. S. (1988). Sex differences in occupational performance expectations. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 75-90.

Brilhart, J. K., Bourhis, J. S., Miley, B. R., & Berquist, C. A. (1992). Practical public speaking. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Briton, N. J., & Hall, J. A. (1995). Beliefs about female and male nonverbal communication. Sex Roles, 32(1-2), 79-90.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 61, 365-374.

Buck, R. (1984). The communication of emotion. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G. (1989). Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Burleson, B. R., & Samter, W. (1992). Are there gender differences in the relationship between academic performance and social behavior? Human Communication Research, 19(1), 155-175.

Butler, J. E., & Walter, J. C. (1991). Transforming the curriculum: Ethnic studies and women's studies. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Campbell, K. K. (1991). Hearing women's voices. Communication Education, 40, 33-48.

Campbell, K. K., (1986). Style and content in the rhetoric of early Afro-American feminists. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 72, 434-445.

Canary, D. J., & Hause, K. S. (1993). Is there any reason to research sex differences in communication? Communication Quarterly, 41(2), 129-144.

Cannon, L. W. (1990). Fostering positive race, class, and gender dynamics in the classroom. Women's Studies Quarterly, 1-2, 126-133.

Carli, L. L. (1990). Gender, language, and influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 941-951.

Carli, L. L. (1989). Gender differences in interaction style and influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 565-576.

Carli, L. L., LaFleur, S. J., & Loeber, C. C. (1995). Nonverbal behavior, gender and influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68(6), 1030-1041.

Carter, K., & Spitzack, C. (1990). Transformation and empowerment in gender and communication courses. Women Studies in Communication, 13(1), 92-110.

Cawyer, C. S., Bystrom, D., Miller, J., Simonds, C., O'Brien, M., & Storey-Martin, J. (1994). Communicating gender equity: Representation and portrayal of women and men in introductory communication textbooks. Communication Studies, 45, 325-331.

Chamberlain, M. K. (Ed.). (1988). Women in academe: Progress and prospects. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chang, M. J., & Gruner, C. R. (1981). Audience reaction to self-disparaging humor. The Southern States Speech Communication Journal, 46, 419-426.

Chodorow, N. J. (1995). Gender as a personal and cultural construction. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 20(3), 516-544.

Clark, R. A. (1993). Men's and women's self-confidence in persuasive, comforting and justificatory communicative tasks. Sex Roles, 28(9-10), 553-565.

Claxton, C. S., & Murrell, P. H. (1987). Learning styles: Implications for improving educational practices (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Coates, J. (1986). Women, men and language. London, UK: Longman.

Collett, J., & Serrano, B. (1992). Stirring it up: The inclusive classroom. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 49, 35-48.

Cooper, P. J. (1993). Communication and gender in the classroom. In L. P. Arliss & D. J. Borisoff (Eds.), Women and men communicating: Challenges and changes (pp. 122-141). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Cooper, P. J. (1995). Communication for the classroom teacher (5th ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Cope, R. G. (1987). Opportunity from strength: Strategic planning clarified with case examples (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Copeland, L. (Ed.). (1973). The world's greatest speeches (3rd. Ed.). New York, NY: Dover Publications.

Crawford, M. (1989). Humor in conversational context: Beyond biases in the study of gender and humor. In R. Unger (Ed.)., Representations: Social constructions of gender (pp. 155-166). New York, NY: Baywood.

Crawford, M., & Gressley, D. (1991). Creativity, caring and context: Women's and men's accounts of humor preferences and practices. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 217-231.

Crawford, M., & MacLeod, M. (1990). Gender in the college classroom: An assessment of the "chilly climate" for women. Sex Roles, 23(3-4), 101-125.

Crosby, F., Allen, B., Culbertson, T., Wally, C., Morith, J., Hall, R., & Nunes, B. (1994). Taking selectivity into account, how much does gender composition matter?: A re-analysis of M. E. Tidball's research. NWSA Journal, 6(1), 107-118.

Daly, J. A., Kreiser, P. O., & Roghaar, L. A. (1994). Question-asking comfort: Explorations of the demography of communication in the eight grade classroom. Communication Education, 43, 26-41.

Darling, A. L. (1989). Signalling non-comprehension in the classroom: Toward a descriptive typology. Communication Education, 38, 34-40.

Daubman, K. A., Heatherington, L., & Ahn, A. (1992). Gender and the self-presentation of academic achievement. Sex Roles, 27(3-4), 187-204.

Daubman, K. A., & Lehman, T. C. (1993). The effects of receiving help: Gender differences in motivation and performance. Sex Roles, 28(11-12), 693-707.

Davis, B. G. (1989). Demystifying assessment: Learning from the field of evaluation. In P. J. Gray (Ed.), Achieving assessment goals using evaluation techniques: New Directions for Higher Education, 67) (pp. 5-20). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, B. G. (1993). Tools for teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Deaux, K., & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An interactive model of gender-related behavior. Psychology Bulletin, 94, 369-389.

De Klerk, V. (1991). Expletives: Men Only? Communication Monographs, 58, 156-167.

Denton, M., & Zeytinoglu, I. U. (1993). Perceived participation in decision-making in a university setting: The impact of gender. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 46(2), 320-331.

Deutsch, F. M., LaBaron, D. & Fryer, M. M. (1987). What is in a smile? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 341-352.

DeVito, J. A. (1994). Human communication: The basic course (6th ed.). New York, NY: HarperCollins College.

Diamond, R. M. (1989). Designing and improving courses and curricula in higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

DiCroce, D. M. (1995). Women and the community college presidency: Challenges and possibilities. In B. K. Townsend (Ed.), Gender and power in the community college: New Directions for Community Colleges, 89 (pp. 79-88). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Dindia, K. (1987). The effects of sex of subject and sex of partner on interruptions. Human Communication Research, 13, 345-371.

Dipboye, R. L. (1987). Problems and progress of women in management. In K. S. Koziara, M. H. Moskow, & Tanner, L. D. (Eds.), Working women: Past, present, future (pp. 118-153). Washington, DC: Bureau of National Affairs.

Dooris, M. J., & Lozier, G. G. (1990). Adapting formal planning approaches: The Pennsylvania State University. In F. A. Schmidtlein & T. H. Milton (Eds.), Adapting strategic planning to campus realities: New Directions for Institutional Research, 67 (pp. 5-21). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Driskell, J. E., Olmstead, B., & Salas, E. (1993). Task cues, dominance cues, and influence in task groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 51-60.

Drory, A., & Beaty, D. (1991). Gender differences in the perception of organizational influence tactics. Human Communication Research, 16, 603-620.

Dunn, K. (1993). Feminist teaching: Who are your students? Women's Studies Quarterly, 3-4, 39-45.

Dunn, R. (1993). Learning styles of the multiculturally diverse. Emergency Librarian, 20(4), 24-32.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 111, 915-928.

Eagly, A. H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1991). Are women evaluated more favorably than men? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 203-216.

Eckman, P., Friesen, W., & Ellsworth, P. (1971). Emotion in the human face: Guidelines for research and an integration of findings. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Erwin, T. D. (1991). Assessing student learning and development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fabes, R. A., & Laner, M. R. (1986). How the sexes perceive each other: Advantages and disadvantages. Sex Roles, 15, 3-4.

Feingold, A. (1990). Gender differences in effects of physical attractiveness on romantic attraction: A comparison across five research paradigms. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 981-993.

Feingold, A. (1992). Sex differences in variability in intellectual abilities: A new look at an old controversy. Review of Educational Research, 62(1), 61-84.

Ferber, R. (1995). Is speakers' gender discernible in transcribed speech? Sex Roles, 32(3-4), 209-223.

Ferree, M. M., & Hall, E. J. (1990). Visual images of American society: Gender and race in introductory sociology textbooks. Gender and Society, 4, 500-533.

Fiske, E. P. (1990, April 11). How to learn in colleges: Group study, many tests. The New York Times, p. A1.

Foss, K. A. (1992). Revisioning the American public address course. Women's Studies in Communication, 15(2), 66-78.

Foss, K. A., & Foss, S. K. (1988). What distinguishes feminist scholarship in communication. Women's Studies in Communication, 11, 9-11.

Foss, S. K. (1992). Revisioning the public speaking course. Women's Studies in Communication, 15(2), 53-65.

Foss, S. K., Foss, K. A., & Trapp, R. (1991). Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (1992). A feminist perspective on rhetorical theory: Toward a clarification of boundaries. Western Journal of Communication, 56, 330-349.

Fox-Genovese, E. (1989). The feminist challenge to the canon. National Forum, 69, 32-35.

Fox-Genovese, E. (1991). Feminism without illusions. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Freeman, H. R. (1994). Student evaluations of college instructors: Effects of type of course taught, instructor gender and gender role, and student gender. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86(4), 627-630.

Freeman, V. (1990). he gender integration project at Piscataway Township schools: Quilting a new pedagogical patchwork through curriculum re-vision. Women's Studies Quarterly, 1-2, 70-77.

Friedman, S. S. (1985). Authority in the feminist classroom: A contradiction in terms? In M. Culley & C. Portuges (Eds.), Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching (pp. 203-208). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Fuhrmann, B. S., & Grasha, A. F. (1983). A practical handbook for college teachers. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Gall, M. (1984). Synthesis of research on teachers' questioning. Educational Leadership, 42, 40-47.

Gallo, M. (1987). Sex bias in counseling materials: A follow-up study. Unpublished manuscript, Rutgers University, Department of Communication, New Brunswick, NJ.

Garcia, M. (1995). Engendering student services. In B. K. Townsend (Ed.), Gender and power in the community college: New Directions for Community Colleges, 89 (pp. 29-37). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Garlick, R. (1994). Male and female responses to ambiguous instructor behaviors. Sex Roles, 30(1-2), 135-158.

Gerdes, E. P. (1995). Women preparing for traditionally male professions: Physical and psychological symptoms associated with work and home stress. Sex Roles, 32(11-12), 787-807.

Gerlach, J., & Hart, B. L. (1992). Gender equity in the classroom: An inventory. Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 19(1), 49-54.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Good, T. L, Slavings, R. L., Harel, K. H., & Emerson, H. (1987). Student passivity: A study of question asking in K-12 classrooms. Sociology of Education, 60, 181-199.

Good, T. L, Slavings, R. L., & Mason, D. A. (1988). Learning to ask questions: Grade and school effects. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4, 363-378.

Goodstein, L. (1994). The failure of curriculum transformation at a major public university: When "diversity" equals "variety". NWSA Journal, 6(1), 82-102.

Goodwin, L. D., & Stevens, E. A. (1993). The influence of gender on university faculty members' perceptions of "good teaching. Journal of Higher Education, 64(2), 166-185.

Green, M. F. (Ed.). (1989). inorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Gregg, N. (1987). Reflections on the feminist critique of objectivity. Journal of Communication Inquiry, 11, 79-86.

Greive, D. (Ed.). (1990). A handbook for adjunct/part-time faculty and teachers of adults (Rev. ed.). Cleveland, OH: INFO-TEC.

Griffin, C. L. (1993). Women as communicators: Mary Daly's hagiography as rhetoric. Communication Monographs, 60, 158-177.

Haiman, F. S. (1991). Sexist speech and the first amendment. Communication Education, 40, 1-5.

Hall. J. A. (1978). Gender effects in decoding nonverbal cues. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 845-857.

Hall, J. A. (1979). Gender, gender roles, and nonverbal communication skills. In R. Rosenthal (Ed.), Skill in nonverbal communication: Individual differences (pp. 32-67). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.

Hall, J. A. (1984). Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hall, J. A., & Braunwald, K. G. (1981). Gender cues in conversations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 99-110.

Hall, J. A., Braunwald, K.G., & Mroz, B. J. (1982). Gender, affect, and influence in a teaching situation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 270-280.

Hall, R., & Sandler, B. R. (1982). The classroom climate: A chilly one for women? Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Hall, R., & Sandler, B. R. (1983). Academic mentoring for women students and faculty: A new look at an old way to get ahead. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 891)

Hamilton, S. (1987). A communication audit handbook: Helping organizations communicate. New York, NY: Longman.

Hanna, M. S., & Gibson, J. W. (1995). Public speaking for personal success (4th ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Harris, J., Silverstein, J., & Andrews, D. (1989). Educating women in science. In C. Pearson, D. Shavik, J. Touchton, (Eds.), Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education. New York, NY: American Council on Education and MacMillan.

Hedges, L. V., & Friedman, L. (1993). Gender differences in variability in intellectual abilities: A reanalysis of Feingold's results. Review of Educational Research, 63(1), 94-105.

Heilman, M. E., Block, D. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterization of men, women and managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(6), 935-942.

Helle, A. (1994). Reading the rhetoric(s) of curriculum transformation. NWSA Journal, 6(3), 434-441.

Henley, N. M (1977). Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hensel, N. (1991). Realizing gender equality in higher education (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Hickson, M. L., Stacks, D. W. (1993). Nonverbal communication: Studies and applications (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Higginbotham, E. (1990). Designing an inclusive curriculum: Bringing all women into the core. Women's Studies Quarterly, 1-2, 7-23.

Higgins, R. L, Snyder, C. R., & Verglas, S. (1990). Self-handicapping: The paradox that isn't. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Sex differences in empathy and related behviors. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 712-722.

Holmes, J. (1990). Hedges and boosters in women's and men's speech. Language and Communication, 10, 185-205.

Hornig, L. S. (1980). Untenured and tenuous: The status of women faculty. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 448, 115-125.

Hunter, D. E., (1989). Women's ways of sharing: Knowledge dissemination at professional conferences. Initiatives, 52(2), 15-21.

Hutchinson, L. M., & Beadle, M. E., (1992). Professors' communication styles: How they influence male and female seminar participants. Teaching and Teacher Education, 8(4), 405-415.

Hyde, J. S., & Linn, M. C. (1988). ender differences in verbal ability: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 104, 53-69.

Infante, D. A. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 72-80.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: EdITS.

Ivy, D. K. (1993). When the power lines aren't clearly drawn: A survey of peer sexual harassment. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Western States Communication Association, Albuquerque, NM.

Ivy, D. K, & Backlund, P. (1994). Exploring genderspeak. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

James, D., & Drakich, J. (1993). Understanding gender differences in amount of talk: A critical review of research. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Gender and conversational interaction (pp. 281-312). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, R. Y. (1993). The intersection of gender and culture in the teaching of writing. College Teaching, 41(1), 19-24.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1990). Cooperative learning: An active learning strategy. Focus on Teaching and Learning, 5, 1-8.

Jordan, T. E. (1989). Measurement and evaluation in higher education: Issues and illustrations. London, UK: The Falmer Press.

Jordan, F. F., McGreal, E. A., & Wheeless, V. E. (1990). Student perceptions of teacher sex-role orientation and use of power strategies and teacher sex as determinants of student attitudes toward learning. Communication Quarterly, 38, 43-53.

Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (1986). Models of teaching (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Karabenick, S. A., & Sharma, R. (1994). Perceived teacher support of student questioning in the college classroom: Its relation to student characteristics and role in the classroom questioning process. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86(1), 90-103.

Kashima, Y., Yamaguchi, S., Kim, U., Choi, S., Gelfand, M. J., & Yuki, M. (1995). Culture, gender and self: A perspective from individualism-collectivism research. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(5), 925-937.

Kaufman, G., & Blakely, M. K. (1980). Pulling our own strings. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.

Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1996). Public speaking in a diverse society. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy: The management revolution in higher education. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Kelly, J. (1991). A study of gender differential linguistic interaction in the adult classroom. Gender and Education, 3(2), 137-143.

Kember, D., & Gow, L. (1994). Orientations to teaching and their effect on the quality of student learning. Journal of Higher Education, 65(1), 58-74.

Kierstead, D., D'Agostin, P., & Dill, H. (1988). Sex role stereotyping of college professors: Bias in student rating of instructors. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 342-244.

Knapp, M. L, & Hall, H. A. (1992) Nonverbal communication in human interaction. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kolb, D. A. (1976). Learning style inventory technical manual. Boston, MA: McBer and Co.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experiences as a source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kramarae, C. (1981). Women and men speaking: Frameworks for Analysis. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Laden, B. V., & Turner, C. S. V. (1995). Viewing community college students through the lenses of gender and color. In B. K. Townsend (Ed.), Gender and power in the community college: New Directions for Community Colleges, 89 (pp. 15-27). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and woman's place. New York, NY: Harper Torch Books.

Lamude, K. G., & Daniels, T. D. (1990). Mutual evaluations of communication competence in superior-subordinate relationships: Sex role incongruency and pro-male bias. Women's Studies in Communication, 13(2), 39-56.

Lay, M. M. (1989). Interpersonal conflict in collaborative writing: What we can learn from gender studies. Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 3(2), 5-28.

Layng, A. (1991). Sexism and classroom humor. College Teaching, 39(2), 43.

Levine, A. (1989). Shaping higher education's future: Demographic realities and opportunities 1990-2000. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Linkugel, W. A., Allen, R. R., & Johannesen, R. L. (1992). Contemporary American speeches (5th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley.

Linver, S. (1994). Speak and get results. New York, NY: Fireside Books.

Lippert-Martin, K. (1992). On campus with women. AAC Newsletter, 21, 1-10.

Lockhart, D. C. (Ed.). (1984). Making effective use of mailed questionnaires. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Long, H. B., & Blanchard, D. (1991). Women's students: The community/junior college connection. Community/Junior College, 47, 47-56.

Lucaites, J. L. (Ed.). (1989). Great speakers and speeches. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Lundeberg, M. A., Fox, P. W., & Puncochar, J. (1994). Highly confident by wrong: Gender differences and similarities in confidence judgments. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86(1), 114-121.

Luttrell, W. (1993). "The teachers, they all had their pets": Concepts of gender, knowledge, and power. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 18(3), 506-546.

Maccoby, E. E. (1988). Gender as a social category. Developmental Psychology, 24, 755-765.

Madison, A. M. (1992). Primary inclusion of culturally diverse minority program participants in the evaluation process. In A. M. Madison (Ed.), Minority issues in program evaluation: New Directions for Program Evaluation, 53 (pp. 35-43). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mahr. F. (1985). Classroom pedagogy and the new scholarship on women. In M. Culley & C. Portuges (Eds.), Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching (pp. 29-48). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mahr, F. A., & Tetreault, M. K. T. (1994). The feminist classroom: An inside look at how professors and students are transforming higher education for a diverse society. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Major, B., Schmidlin, A. M., & Williams, L. (1990). Gender patterns in soical touch: The impact of setting and age. In C. Mayo & N. M. Henley (Eds.), Gender and nonverbal behavior (pp. 3-37). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Makau, J. M. (1992). Revisioning the argumentation course. Women's Studies in Communication, 15(2), 79-91.

Mandel, S. (1993). Effective presentation skills: A practical guide for better speaking (Rev. ed.). Menlo Park, CA: Crisp Publications, Inc.

Marche, T. A., & Peterson, C. (1993a). On the gender differential use of listener responsiveness. Sex Roles, 29(11-12), 795-816.

Marche, T. A., & Peterson, C. (1993b). The development and sex-related use of interruption behavior. Human Communication Research, 19(3), 388-408.

Markham, P. L. (1988). Gender and the perceived expertness of the speaker as factors in ESL listening recall. TESOL Quarterly, 22, 397-405.

Martin, M. (1984). Power and authority in the classroom: Sexist stereotypes in teaching evaluations. Signs: Journal of Owomen in Culture and Society, 9(3), 482-492).

McArthur, B. (Ed.). (1992). The penguin book of twentieth century speeches. New York, NY: Penguin Group.

McCarthy, C. (1990). Multicultural education, minority identities, textbooks, and the challenge of curriculum reform. Journal of Education, 172(2), 118-129.

McCroskey, J. C. (1984). The communication apprehension perspective. In J. A. Daly & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.). Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension (pp. 13-38). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McElrath, K. (1992). Gender, career disruption, and academic rewards. Journal of Higher Education, 63(3), 269-281.

McKeachie, W. J. (1994). Teaching tips: Strategies, research and theory for college and university teachers (9th ed.). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company.

McKinney, K. (1987). Age and gender differences in college students' attitudes toward women: A replication and extension. Sex Roles, 17, 353-358.

McPhail, I. P. (1996). General education update. St. Louis, MO: St. Louis Community College.

Miller, J. B. (1986). Toward a new psychology of women (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Beracon Press.

Mongomery, B. M. (1988). Quality communication in personal relationships. In S. W. Duck (Ed.), Handbook of personal relationships (pp. 343-366). New York, NY: John Wiley.

Morine-Dershimer, G., & Teneberg, M. (1981). Participant perspectives of classroom discourse. Final Report NIE-G-78-0161. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Morris, L., & Handley, H. (1985). Listening to adolescents: Gender differences in science classroom interaction. In L. Wilkinson & C. Marrett (Eds.), Gender influences in classroom interaction (pp. 37-56). New York, NY: Academic Books.

Morrison, J. L., Renfro, W. L., & Boucher, W. I. (1984). Futures research and the strategic planning process (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 9). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Mulac, A., & Lundell, T. L. (1994). Effects of gender-linked language differences in adults' written discourse: Multivariate tests on language effects. Language & Communication, 4(3), 299-309.

Mulac, A., Lundell, T. L., & Bradac, J. J. (1986). Male/female language and attributional consequences in a public speaking situation: Toward an explanation of the gender-linked language effect. Communication Monographs, 53, 115-129.

Mulac, A., Wiemann, J. M., Widenmann, S. J., & Gibson, T. W. (1988). Male/female language differences and efects in same-sex and mixed sex dyads: The gender linked language effect. Communication Monographs, 55, 315-335.

Mulvaney, B. M. (1994). Gender differences in communication: An intercultural experience. [On-line], Available: INTERNET File: ftp://cpsr.org/cpsr/gender/mulvaney.txt.

Nadler, A., & Fisher, J. D. (1986). The role of threat to self-esteem and perceived control in recipient reaction to help: Theory development and empirical validations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 19). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Nadler, A., & Porat, I. (1978). When names do not help: Effects of anonymity and locus of need attribution on help-seeking behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4, 624-630.

Nadler, L. B., & Nadler, M. K. (1990). Perceptions of sex differences in classroom communication. Women's Studies in Communication, 13(1), 46-65.

Nadler, L. B., Nadler, M. K., & Todd-Mancillas, W. R. (Eds.). (1987). Advances in gender and communication research. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Natalle, E. J. (1991). Gender and communication theory. Communication Education, 40, 94-104.

Nelson, K. (1990). Gender communication through small groups. English Journal, 79(2), 58-61.

Nicholas, F. W., & Oliver, A. R. (1994) Achieving diversity among community college faculty. In W. B. Harvey & J. Valadez (Eds.), Creating and maintaining a diverse faculty: New Directions for Community Colleges, 87 (pp. 35-42). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Nicotera, A. M., & Rancer, A. S. (1994). The influence of sex on self-perceptions and social stereotyping of aggressive communication predispositions. Western Journal of Communication, 58, 283-307.

Noller, P. (1986). Sex differences in nonverbal communication: Advantage lost or supremacy gained? Australian Journal of Psychology, 38, 23-32.

Nova Southeastern University. (1994). Questionnaire: Learning activity package (rev. ed.). Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Author.

Nudd, D. M. (1991). Establishing the balance: Re-examining students' androcentric readings of Katherine Anne Porter's "Rope". Communication Education, 40, 49-59.

Nussbaum, J. F. (1992). Effective teacher behaviors. Communication Education, 41, 167-180.

Nye, E. F. (1991). Computers and gender: Noticing what perpetuates inequality. English Journal, 80(3), 94-95.

O'Barr, W. M., & Atkins, B. K. (1980). Women's language or powerless language? In S. MCconnell-Ginet (Ed.), Women and language in literature and society (pp. 93-110). New York, NY: Praeger.

Olson, G. A., & Ashton-Jones, E. (1992). Doing gender: (En)gendering academic mentoring. Journal of Education, 174(3), 114-127.

Opp, R. D., & Smith, A. B. (1994). Effective strategies for enhancing minority faculty recruitment and retention. In W. B. Harvey & J. Valadez (Eds.), Creating and Maintaining a Diverse Faculty (pp. 43-55). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Oppenheim, A. N. (1966). Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books.

Ortiz, J. (1988, October). Creating conditions for student questions. Paper presented at the National Seminar on Successful College Teaching, Orlando, FL.

Osgood, C. (1988). Osgood on speaking. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Paige-Pointer, B., & Auletta, G. S. (1990). Restructuring the curriculum: Barriers and bridges. Women's Studies Quarterly, 1-2, 86-94.

Patai, D., & Kortege, N. (1994). Professing feminism: Cautionary tales from the strange world of women's studies. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Pearce, K. C., & Natalie, E. J. (1993). Deconstructing gender differences in persuasibility: A bricolage. Women's Studies in Communication, 16(1), 55-73.

Pearson, J. C. (1991). Gender bias in the college classroom. In J. Nyquist, R. Abbott, D. Wulff, & J. Sprague (Eds.), Preparing the professoriate of tomorrow to teach: Selected readings for TA training (pp. 25-32). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Pearson, J. C., & Nelson, P. E. (1994). Understanding and sharing: An introduction to Speech Communication (6th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Pearson, J. C., Turner, L. H., & Todd-Mancillas, W. (1991). Gender and communication (2nd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Pearson, J. C., & West, R. (1991). An initial investigation of the effects of gender on student questions in the classroom: Developing a descriptive base. Communication Education, 40, 22-32.

Pearson, J. C., West, R. L., & Turner, L. H. (1995). Gender and communication (3rd ed.). Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.

Penelope, J. (1990). Speaking freely: Unlearning the lies of the fathers' tongues. New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Peterson, E. E. (1991). Moving towards a gender balanced curriculum in basic speech communication courses. Communication Education, 40, 60-72.

Peterson, K. (1994, September 7). Teens' tales from the classroom. USA Today, pp. 1-2D.

Peterson, M. W. (1980). Analyzing alternative approaches to planning. In P. Jedamus', H. Peterson, & Associates, Improving academic management: A handbook of planning and institutional research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Peterson, S. B., & Kroner, T. (1992). Gender biases in textbooks for introductory psychology and human development. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16, 17-36.

Pfeiffer, J. (1985). Girl talk, boy talk. Science, 85, 58-63.

Philbin, M., Meier, E., Huffman, S., & Boverie, P. (1995). A survey of gender and learning styles. Sex Roles, 32(7-8), 485-494.

Potter, W. J., & Emanuel, R. (1990). Students' preferences for communication styles and their relationship to achievement. Communication Education, 39, 234-249.

Powers, W. G. (1993). The effects of gender and consequence upon perceptions of deceivers. Communication Quarterly, 41(3), 328-337.

Raines, R. S., Hechtman, S. B., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). Nonverbal behavior and gender as determinants of physical attractiveness. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 14, 253-267.

Rakow, L. F. (1992). Revisioning the curriculum: A commentary. Women's Studies in Communication, 15(2), 92-96.

Ray, G. (1986). Vocally cued personality prototypes: An implicit personality theory. Communication Monographs, 53, 266-276.

Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (1992). Designing and conducting survey research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Payne, S. K. (1991). Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Riddell, S. (1989). Pupils, resistance and gender codes: A study of classroom encounters. Gender and Education, 1(2), 183-197.

Ringle, P. M., & Capshaw, F. W. (1990). Issue-oriented planning: Essex Community College. In F. A. Schmidtlein & T. H. Milton (Eds.), Adapting strategic planning to campus realities: New Directions for Institutional Research 67 (pp. 69-82). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Roach, K. D. (1991). The influence and effects of gender and status on university instructor affinity-seeking behavior. Southern Communication Journal, 73-80.

Roberts, T. (1991). Gender and the influence of evaluations on self-assessments in achievement settings. Psychological Bulletin, 109, 297-308.

Roberts, T. A., & Nolan-Hoeksema, S. (1994). Gender comparisons in responsiveness to others' evaluations in achievement settings. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18, 221-240.

Roop, L. J. (1989). The English teacher as midwife: Gender sensitivity in teaching methods. English Journal, 78(6), 90-91.

Rosser, S. V. (1990). Female friendly science. New York: Pergamon Press.

Rothenberg, P. (1994). Rural U.: A cautionary tale. NWSA Journal, 6(2), 291-298.

Rubin, R. B., & Graham, E. E. (1988). Communication correlates of college success: An exploratory investigation. Communication Education, 37, 14-27.

Rubin, R. B., Graham, E. E., & Mignerey, J. T. (1990). A longitudinal study of college students' communication competence. Communication Education, 39, 1-14.

Ryan, M. (1989). Classroom and contexts: The challenge of feminist pedagogy. Feminist Teacher, 4, 39-42.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1992). Ensuring equitable participation in college classes. New directions for Teaching and Learning, 49, 49-56.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1986, March). Sexism in the classroom: From grade school to graduate school. Phi Delta Kappan, 512-515.

Sagrestano, L. M. (1992). The use of power and influence in a gendered world. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16, 439-447.

St. Louis Community College. (1990). Communications department program evaluation. St. Louis, MO: Author.

St. Louis Community College. (1994). Communications department program evaluation. St. Louis, MO: Author.

Sandler, B. R. (1991). Women faculty at work in the classroom, or, why it still hurts to be a woman in labor. Communication Education, 40, 6-15.

Sapon-Shevin, M., & Schniedewind, N. (1992). If cooperative learning's the answer, what are the questions? Journal of Education, 174(2), 11-37.

Schaum, M., & Flanagan, C. (1992). Gender images: Readings for composition. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Schmidtlein, F. A. (1990). Responding to diverse institutional issues: Adapting strategic planning concepts. In F. A. Schmidtlein & T. H. Milton (Eds.), Adapting strategic planning to campus realities: New Directions for Institutional Research 67 (pp. 83-93). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schniedewind, N. (1987). Feminist values: Guidelines for teaching methodology in women's studies. In I. Shor (Ed.), Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching (pp. 170-179). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Schniedewind, N. (1993). Teaching feminist process in the 1990's. Women's Studies Quarterly, 3-4, 17-30.

Schumacher, S., & McMillan, J. H. (1993). Research in education, (3rd. ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Selnow, G. W. (1985). Sex differences in uses and perceptions of profanity. Sex Roles, 12, 303-312.

Serbin, L. A., Zelkowitz, P., Doyle, A. B., Gold, D., & Wheaton, B. (1990). The socialization of sex-differentiated skills and academic performance: A mediational model. Sex Roles, 23(11-12), 613-628.

Seymour, D. T. (1988). Developing academic programs: The climate for innovation (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Shepherd, G. J. (1992). Communication as influence: Definitional exclusion. Communication Studies, 43, 203-219.

Shor, I. (1987). Educating the educators: A Freirean approach to the crisis in teacher education. In I. Shor (Ed.), Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching (pp. 7-32). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Shrewsbury, C. M. (1993a). What is feminist pedagogy? Women's Studies Quarterly, 3-4, 8-16.

Shrewsbury, C. M. (1993b). Feminist pedagogy: An updated bibliography. Women's Studies Quarterly, 3-4, 148-160.

Siegman, A. W. (1987). The teltale voice: Nonverbal messages of verbal communication. In A. W. Seigman & S. Feldstein (Eds.), Nonverbal behavior and communication (2nd ed.) (pp. 351-434). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Simeone, A. (1987). Academic women: Working towards equality. South Hadley, MS: Bergin & Garvey.

Simkins-Bullock, J. A., & Wildman, B. G. (1991). An investigation into the relationships between gender and language. Sex Roles, 24(3-4), 149-160.

Smith, T. C. (1991). Making successful presentations (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Smith, D. G., Morrison, D. E., & Wolf, L. E. (1994). College as a gendered experience: An empirical analysis using multiple lenses. Journal of Higher Education, 65(6), 696-725.

Snyder, T. D., & Hoffman, C. M. (October, 1993). Digest of education statistics 1993. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education.

Southwest Institute for Research on Women. (1986). Ideas and resources for integrating women's studies into the curriculum: Western states project on women in the curriculum. University of Arizona. [On-line], Available: INTERNET File: ...urcesByTopic/ WomensStudies/Development+Support/curriculum-integration.

Spain, D. (1992). Gendered spaces. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Speech Communication Association. (1995). Speech and listening competencies for sophomores in college. Annandale, VA: Author.

Spencer, A., & Podmore, D. (Eds.). (1987). In a man's world: Essays on women in male-dominated professions. London, UK: Tavistock.

Spitzack C., & Carter, K. (1988). Feminist communication: Rethinking the politics of exclusion. Women's Studies in Communication, 11, 32-36.

Stahl, F. A. (1993). Let my gender grow. College Teaching, 41(1), 2.

Statham, A., Richardson, L., & Cook, J. A. (1991). Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stecklein, J. E., & Lorenz, G. E. (1986). Academic women: Twenty four years of progress? Liberal Education, 72(1), 63-71.

Steil, J. M., & Weltman, K. (1992). Influence strategies at home and at work: A study of sixty dual career couples. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9, 65-88.

Stewart, L. P., Cooper, P. J., Stewart, A. D., & Friedley, S. A. (1996). Communication between the sexes (3rd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Stewart, L. P., Stewart, A. D., Friedley, S. A., & Cooper, P. J. (1990). Communication between the sexes (2nd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch, Scarisbrick.

Stockdill, S. F., Duhon-Sells, R. M., Olson, R. A., & Patton, M. Q. (1992). Voices in the design and evaluation of a multicultural education program: A developmental approach. In A. M. Madison (Ed.), Minority issues in program evaluation: New Directions for Program Evaluation, 53 (pp. 17-33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Street, R. L., Jr., Brady, R. M., & Lee. R. (1984). Evaluative responses to communicators: The effects of speech rate, sex and interaction content. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 48, 14-27.

Street, S., Kromrey, J. D., & Kimmel, E. (1995). University faculty gender roles perceptions. Sex Roles, 32(5-6), 407-422.

Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. (1982). Asking questions: A practical guide to questionnaire design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sullivan, P. A. (1993). Women's discourse and political communication: A case study of congressperson Patricia Schroder. Western Journal of Communication, 57, 530-545.

Sullivan, S. E., & Buttner, E. H. (1992). hanging more than the plumbing: Integrating women and gender differences into management and organizational behavior courses. Journal of Management Education, 16, 76-89.

Swim, J. (1993). In search of gender bias in evaluations and trait inferences: The role of diagnosticity and gender stereotypicality of behavioral information. Sex Roles, 29(3-4), 213-237.

Swim, J., Borgida, E. Maruyama, G., & Myers, D. (1989). Joan McKay versus John McKay: Do gender stereotypes bias evaluators? Psychological Bulletin, 105, 409-429.

Tack, M. W., & Patitu, C. L. (1992). Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Tannen, D. T. (1991). Teachers' classroom strategies should recognize that men and women use language differently. The Chronicle of Higher Education, B1-B3.

Tannen, D. T. (1990). You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. New York, NY: William Morrow.

Tavris, C. (1992). The mismeasure of woman. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Thomas, D. (1991). Rethinking pedagogy in public speaking and American public address: A feminist alternative. Women's Studies in Communication, 14(2), 42-57.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1991). Beyond race and gender: Unleashing the power of your total work force by managing diversity. New York, NY: American Management Association.

Titus, J. J. (1993). Gender messages in education foundations textbooks. Journal of Teacher Education, 44(1), 38-44.

Townsend, B. K. (1995). Women community college faculty: On the margins or in the mainstream? In B. K. Townsend (Ed.), Gender and power in the community college: New Directions for Community Colleges, 89 (pp. 39-46). San Francisco, Ca: Jossey Bass.

Townsend, B. K., Newell, L. J., & Wiese, M. D. (1992). Creating distinctiveness: Lessons from uncommon colleges and universities (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports No. 6). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Turner, L. H., & Sterk, H. M. (Eds.). (1994). Differences that make a difference: xamining the assumptions in gender research. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Twombly, S. B. (1993). What we know about women in community colleges: An examination of the literature using feminist phase theory. Journal of Higher Education, 64(2), 186-210.

University of Maryland at College Park. (1988). Making a difference for women: Report of the committee on undergraduate women's education. [On-line], Available: INTERNET File: ...EdRes/Topic/ WomensStudies/GenderIssues/ChillyClimate/UMPCGreer/report.

Van der Meij, H. (1988). Constraints on question asking in classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80,(6), 401-405.

Vonnegut, K. S. (1992). Listening for women's voices: Revisioning courses in American public address. Communication Education, 41, 26-39.

Wagner, H. L., Buck, R., & Winterbotham, M. (1993). Communication of specific emotions: Gender differences in sending accuracy and communication measures. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 17, 29-53.

Walters, D., (1995). The greatest speakers I ever heard: And what you can learn from them! Waco, TX: WRS Publishing.

Warrick, P. D., & Maglieri, J. A. (1993). Gender differences in planning, attention, simultaneous and successive (PASS) cognitive processes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85(4), 693-701.

Wentzel, K. R. (1991). Social competence at school: Relation between social responsibility and academic achievement. Review of Educational Research, 61, 1-24.

West, R. (1991, November). The effects of teacher immediacy and biological sex on student questions in the college classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Atlanta, GA.

Wheeler, C., Wilson, J., & Tarantola, C. (1976). An investigation of children's social perception of child speakers with reference to verbal style. Central States Speech Journal, 27, 31-35.

Wheeless, V. E., & Berryman-Fink, C. (1985). Perceptions of women managers and their communicator competencies. Communication Quarterly, 22, 133-147.

Wilson, J. S., Stocking, V. B., & Goldstein, D. (1994). Gender differences in motivations for course selection: Academically talented students in an intensive summer program. Sex Roles, 31(5-6), 349-367.

Wilson, K. G., & Davis, B. (1994). Redesigning education. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.

Woike, B. A. (1994). The use of differentiation and integration processes: Empirical studies of "separate" and "connected" ways of thinking. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(1), 142-150.

Wood, J. T. (1993). Bringing different voices into the classroom. NWSA Journal, 5(1), 82-93.

Wood, J. T. (1994). Gendered lives: Communication, gender and culture. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wood, J. T. (1996a). Everyday encounters: An introduction to interpersonal communication. New York, NY: Wadsworth g Company.

Wood, J. T.(Ed.). (1996b). Gendered relationships. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Wood, J. T., & Lenze, L. F. (1991a). Strategies to enhance gender sensitivity in communication education. Communication Education, 40, 16-21.

Wood, J. T., & Lenze, L. F. (1991b). Gender and the development of self: Inclusive pedagogy in interpersonal communication. Women's Studies in Communication, 14, 1-23.

Zahn, C. J. (1989). The bases for differing evaluations of male and female speech: Evidence from ratings of transcribed conversation. Communication Monographs, 56, 59-74.

Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversations. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), Lanuage and sex: Differences and dominance (pp. 105-129). Rowley, MS: Newbury House.